DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 875 EA 015 561

AUTHOR Meyer, Linda A.
TITLE The LEA's Perspective of Change: The Case for Directed Development.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 83
NOTE 70p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Agents; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Tables (Data); Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Direct Instruction Follow Through Project; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

A brief literature review and a report on two studies of change implementation in schools indicate that "directed development," in which experts give help directly to classroom teachers, is the most effective implementation strategy. The author's literature review traces research on program implementation from a 1975 Rand report stressing "mutual adaptation" of school and change programs, through reports on attempts to implement mutual adaptation, to a reanalysis of the Rand data that instead emphasizes directed development. The paper then summarizes two studies evaluating change implementation programs that used directed development. For the first study, covering the School Improvement Program carried out by the New York City Public Schools in 24 public and private schools, the author describes the schools, the project, the variables studied, and the evaluation findings from interviews and a questionnaire survey. The second study involved implementation of the Direct Instruction Follow Through model in one school district. A project description precedes a summary of interview results from the study. Among the author's findings are that the studies support using experts to give teachers direct assistance that results in student achievement gains. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229875

The LEA's Perspective of Change: The Case for Directed Development

Linda A. Meyer

Center for the Study of Reading

University of Illinois

at

Urbana-Champaign

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda A. Meyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 015 661

Paper to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 12, 1983.

Abstract

This paper first traces the history of the literature on implementing change in schools by reviewing and consolidating findings from major studies. These studies produce a research base for a process most clearly described as Directed Development. Next, data are presented from two implementation studies using Directed Development to describe how teachers respond to this type of implementation. Among these many findings are consistent support for experts who are helpful in very practical ways, methods that increase the teachers' expertise, and changes that result in higher student achievement gains.

The LEA's Perspective of Change: The Case for Directed Development

Toward Mutual Adaptation

The unprecedented influx of federal money to schools f[illegible] educational change began in the mid 1960's with the first battles of the War on Poverty. Projects such as Head Start, Follow Through, and Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) emerged as major educational experiments for disadvantaged youth ranging from preschool age through high school. Each of these programs offered the opportunity to study how institutions implementing these programs changed and how the individuals involved perceived the changes. Numerous papers have appeared, in fact, to document each program's success or failure (see Rivlin & Timpane, 1975; Weikart & Banet, 1975) for various articles on Follow Through, while others have examined the processes that the schools or school districts went through to implement their programs (see Zoret, Note 1; Zimiles & Mayer, Note 2, for example). Very little research is published on the teachers and administrators who participated in these studies.

The most widely cited report to document the change process occurring in four such programs (ESEA Title III; ESEA Title VII; Vocational Education, 1968, Amendments, Part D; and Right-to-Read) is most often referred to as the Rand Report (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975) commissioned in 1973 by the U.S. Office of Education. One of the major conclusions of this report was that, "An implementation strategy that promotes mutual adaptation is critical" (p. X). Berman and McLaughlin (1975) derived three additional premises for implementing educational change. The premises that most affect the Local Education Association were:

1. Implementation . . . dominates the innovative process and its outcomes.
2. Effective implementation depends on the receptivity of the institutional setting to change.
3. Local school systems vary in their capacity to deal with innovations and with the stages of the innovative process (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975, p. xi).

Then, Berman and McLaughlin (1975) offered four policy implications derived from the four premises, they are:

1. Policy should be concerned with more than the mere adaption of change agent projects--thereby denying the long-term benefits from previous research by change agents.
2. The critical significance of the institutional setting should come as no surprise to policymakers . . . School districts use external inputs, but typically are not influenced by them to change their commitments.
3. . . . federal policy makers might consider ways of encouraging mutual adaptation strategies . . .
4. Rather than making blanket awards of a fixed number of years, federal change agent policies might be keyed to the stages of innovation . . .

The impact of this report was substantial as researchers and administrators alike accepted "mutual adaptation" as the way to achieve educational change. But further research has questioned the validity of the mutual adaptation process and its outcomes.

"Mutual Adaptation"--Is There Such a Thing?

The Rand Report had substantial impact on federal practices as well as on the tactics of groups funded to implement new programs for the disadvantaged. One such program was the Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE), initiated by the U.S. Office of Education, and reassigned to the National Institute of Education. EBCE was intended for all students "to make education more relevant by getting students out of school and into the world of 'real experience,'" (Farrar, DeSanctis, & Cohen, 1980-a). EBCE had sponsorship from four laboratories (Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Far West Regional Laboratory, Northwest Regional Laboratory, and Research for Better Schools). Each laboratory developed an EBCE "model" during the mid 1970's, and implemented them with demonstrated effectiveness, so that by 1978 EBCE was disseminated to almost all of the fifty states.

But, the Farrar et al (1980-a) report of the overall implementation of EBCE is recorded as, "marked by controversy, negotiation, revision, and adaptation," (Farrar, DeSanctis, & Cohen, 1980-a, p. 85), despite the models' desires for mutually adapted implementations. Farrar et al go on to explain that in some sites entire components of models were not implemented, and that adaptation was seldom mutual, as the sponsors often compromised their models for the sites.

Farrar, DeSanctis, and Cohen (1980-a) report views of EBCE from staff, non-staff, administrators and school board members, as well as the views of the EBCE principals in their studies of the EBCE implementation efforts. These views are summarized as follows.

EBCE staff. There was a great range of views on EBCE from the staff. Some viewed EBCE as an opportunity to work with smaller groups of students on social skills, or individual basic skills. Others seized the opportunity to do more counseling or tutoring. Many administrators and teachers simply ignored career guidance--the mission of the project. Some teachers were resistant, others enjoyed new-found freedom, in short, there was great variety in what teachers did and how they felt about Experience-Based Career Education.

Non-EBCE-staff. There was general resentment toward the EBCE program by non-EBCE staff, although some teachers recognized the need for such a program. Their reasons for resentment ranged from calling it a nuisance, to seeing it as a project that segmented the lowest-performing students. Other teachers and administrators liked to be able to "dump" their lowest-performing students into EBCE.

Administrators and school board members. The general motives for becoming involved in EBCE for administrators and school board members ranged from financial incentives to concerns about the image of the school district. Others were concerned about recruiting students to integrate a school. In many ways, the administrators and school board members' views were very similar to the teachers' views--there were substantial differences from one person to another.

School principals. The EBCE principals also ranged from supportive to the extent that they wanted all of their students in the program to seeing the innovation in a very unfavorable light. Some described EBCE simply as a headache, or nuisance. Farrar et al. (1980-a) conclude, "Like others directly concerned with implementation, principals bring their personal and

professional agendas to the innovation, seek out the features most salient to them, improvise accordingly, and so contribute to the local variation that evolves" (p. 93).

Thus, EBCE staff; administrators and school board members; principals, and non-EBCE staff had very different views about the EBCE program. Their views range from very positive attitudes toward the opportunity to work more closely with individual students, or to better meet the needs of "difficult" students to very negative attitudes about something new and different.

Farrar, DeSanctis, and Cohen (1980-a) speculate that these diverse views may have existed because the strength of local conditions overpowered the weaker federal influence, or because participation in the program was voluntary. Garrar et al. (1980-a) go on to point out that for many federal programs, "while there is some monitoring, it is often sporadic and little more than ritual" (p. 94). They further conclude that the local education agencies (LEA's) are basically independent (loosely coupled--Weick, 1976), and therefore incapable of directing change from the top down. They also offer the metaphor of "The Lawn Party" (Farrar, DeSanctis, & Cohen, 1980-b) in which they suggest that participation in a federally funded program bears some of the same attractions that exist with people attending a lawn party. Different people attend the party for different reasons, and some attend primarily because of financial incentives, or for reasons they cannot explain. A further problem with mutual adaptation encountered by Farrar and her colleagues was that the sponsor groups, not the school personnel did the adapting. Therefore, there was little if any "mutual" adaptation although that was their change model. After reading the Farrar

et al. work, one is left with the impression that the EBCE program implementations were variable and that the attempts at "mutual adaptation" frequently resulted in divergent programs that lack common purposes and commitments. Further research sheds light on why Farrar and her colleagues found what they found.

Mutual Adaptation--Revisited

While Farrar, DeSanctis, and Cohen (1980-a, 1980-b) were studying the attempts at mutual adaptation on the EBCE staff, non-staff, administrators, school board members, and principals, Kennedy (1978) reanalyzed the Follow Through data questioning the "site variation implementation" issue from the Abt Report (Stebbins, St. Pierre, Praper, & Cerva, 1977) and determined that a critical difference between successful and unsuccessful sponsors was the amount of technical assistance that these experts gave directly to the classroom teachers in their projects. Meanwhile, Datta (1980, 1981) was reanalyzing the data and conclusions reported by Berman and McLaughlin (1975) and McLaughlin and Marsh (1978). Datta subsequently produced two enlightening papers (Datta, 1980; Datta, 1981).

In her 1980 work Datta traced the three prevalent beliefs about change that emerged since the mid 1960's--that (1) there should be a systematic, long-term change process (Weikart & Banet, 1975), (2) schools should manage themselves by first analyzing their needs and then monitoring their changes as exemplified in much of the work on organizational development (see Goodlad, 1975; or Schmuck, Runkel, Arends, & Arends, 1977; or Havelock, 1973), or that (3) schools are so loosely coupled (Weick, 1976) that change at one level does not necessarily filter down to change at another level.

Her second paper (Datta, 1981) suggests that, "the programs studied were not examples of massive funds for innovation--at least not the local or per pupil levels--nor of implementing innovations of proven effectiveness, nor of enormous infusions of technical expertise" (Datta, 1981, p. 28). Datta came to these conclusions by reanalyzing the data from the 293 selected projects from 18 states studied by questionnaire in Phase I of Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change (FPSEC) and the 29 case studies developed from 100 site visits in Phase II of the FPSEC Report. Datta's (1981) reanalysis brings to light that the source of the FPSEC data was from projects that mentioned Needs Assessment 78% of the time, using paraprofessionals, 65% of the time, development of new curricula 78% of the time, 75% of the time and fifteen other "innovations" of mention such as counseling (31%), field trips (49%), open classroom (30%), or new management techniques (28%). When searching back just a little further to the regulations for the 4 major types of programs studied by Berman and McLaughlin (1975) it is important to note that the guidelines required the 293 projects to do such things as (1) seed development of model school programs (ESEA Title III), (2) develop diagnostic/prescriptive reading (Right to Read), (3) produce demonstration grants (Vocational Education Act, 1963), or (4) develop exemplary bilingual programs (ESEA Title VII). The key words all of these regulations are "develop," "produce," or synonyms that directed these programs to come up with unique programs.

Datta suggests that so little is actually known about implementation that much of the current literature can best be described as, "fantasizing about how change occurs" (Datta, 1980, p. 102). She criticizes further the

seemingly disproportionate amount of federal and state money that goes to technical assistance in comparison to funds allocated to curriculum development. Datta further questioned the factor analytic methods by which Berman and McLaughlin reduced twenty-eight methods to five program scores. Furthermore, the FPSEC eight volume report rejects the help of "experts," without either defining or describing technical assistance. A startling report from teachers in the projects was that almost one third (29%) seldom received help during the first year of the program (and almost two-thirds did not get to observe in other classrooms). In fact, only a bit more than half (58%) of the teachers report attending "some" meetings on their special project. In short, most of these teachers received little if any help. Datta further points out that even under these conditions, the difference in perceived usefulness favors just ever-so-slightly local assistance over expert assistance.

Two seldom reported findings from the FPSEC study were that (1) "What seemed to carry the variance was teachers' perceived usefulness of the help they received (Datta, 1980, p. 111), and (2) the relationship between consultant help and other variables associated with total student improvement (Datta, 1980, p. 111). Further support for the use of outside consultants comes from changes in teachers' behaviors and student outcomes--particularly when analyzing so-called durable changes, those changes that appear to be maintained over time. Changes in their own behavior that resulted in improved student performance seemed to matter most to these teachers. Particularly interesting are Datta's findings that number of years as a teacher, effectiveness, and support for training did not account for the differences between schools. In addition, the extra money provided

by the programs was apparently unimportant in its implementation or effectiveness. If anything, these reanalyses support the need for expertise from outside experts and directed development instead of supporting local decision-making and implementation strategies.

It is interesting, and perhaps encouraging that the reanalysis of Follow through by Kennedy (1978) and of the Rand Report by Datta (1980, 1981) both support the need for Directed Development for programs servicing school districts with large numbers of disadvantaged students. These findings are also supported by smaller scale empirical research in math (Good & Grauws, 1979), remedial reading (Stallings, 1980), and classroom management (Anderson, Evertson, & Brophy, 1979). The Directed Development model dominates the practices of several school districts striving to make major changes in student achievement--Mastery Learning and CIRCA (Chicago), Promotional Gates and High School Attendance (New York City). Given the background information on change strategies used to produce more effective programs for the disadvantaged, the next part of this paper will present data from two research studies concerned with documenting the changes that teachers and other school personnel undergo as a new program is implemented. The first data are from the "School Improvement Project" (SIP) in New York City which grew primarily from the New York City Central Board's desire to implement the Edmonds (1979) findings on characteristics of effective schools. This is a three year report of quasi Directed Development at the variable level but not at the what do you do tomorrow level. The second report will be from the second year of an implementation study of the Direct Instruction Follow Through site. These descriptions will be somewhat lengthy and elaborate because both studies involve a number of

questions addressing the process of change from a variety of perspectives. This paper will then conclude with a discussion of the similarities and differences of these two investigations, suggestions on why the Directed Development Model is as effective as it is, and the implications for further implementation interventions.

Implementing Findings from Research on Effective Schools

Background

In 1979 the New York City Public Schools received funding from the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation for technical assistance to implement findings from the research on effective schools (Edmonds, 1979). The School Improvement Project (SIP) derived from Edmonds' (1979) five variables derived from his research on effective schools: (1) administrative style, (2) instructional emphasis on basic skills, (3) school climate, (4) ongoing assessment of pupil progress, and (5) teacher expectations. The primary goal of the School Improvement Project was to work with schools in New York City, focusing on these five areas by first assessing the school's needs in each area, and then working with the schools to improve the school in the areas identified in the Needs Assessment. The data summary that follows is culled from the Third Annual Process Evaluation (1981-1982) by McCarthy, Canner, Chawla, and Pershing (Note 3).

The schools. Nineteen public and five non-public elementary schools participated in this study. Of the non-public schools, seven were in SIP for their third year, eight schools were in their second year, and 4 schools were new to SIP. For the sake of clarification and consistency, three year schools will be called Cohort 1, two year schools, Cohort 2, and first year

schools Cohort 3. Each of the schools met three criteria for inclusion in the sample: (1) the principals volunteered, (2) school needs and the goals of the school improvement project meshed, and (3) there were no other school development projects ongoing in the schools. The schools were located throughout New York City's five boroughs. They ranged in size from about 350 to 1400 students with a range in low-income students from 9% to almost 90%, and a range in ethnic composition from about 12% to almost 100% Black, 3% to over 75% Hispanic, a similar range for White students, and a range from 0% to almost 5% Asian. As ranked on the New York City Reading test, the schools ranged from almost 75% of the students reading at or above grade level to a low of a majority of the students reading at or above grade level.

The liaisons. Each school had a liaison assigned from the Central Board of Education. This individual was first to assist in the Needs Assessment for the school and then to support the other phases of the project such as the formation of school committees, and the development of school plans for improvement, implementation, and monitoring. The data for this report were gathered from principals, assistant principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, auxiliary staff, and parents--with each group most often responding to the same questions and thus providing multiple perspectives on the same issues. The data were gathered from interviews or questionnaires, and the student achievement data from each school for the five school years prior to this intervention as well as student achievement data for the years of the school's participation in SIP were also collected to serve as measures of change.

Documentation unit. The Documentation Unit from the Central Board of Education kept ongoing records of the interventions from the liaison's logs, and other minutes, notes, statistical student data, and project documents. This unit developed reports at the end of each of the three years of SIP. A fourth report will soon be available to address the changes in student performance in each of the SIP schools.

Interviews and questionnaires. There were three structured interviews with administrators, liaisons, and principals conducted by staff from the Documentation Unit. Two forced-choice (yes or no) questionnaires were administered. The first questionnaire dealt with 23 questions pertaining to the Planning Committee, that committee that would plan the school improvement tasks. The second questionnaire was 14 items long and was a School Questionnaire. This questionnaire went to everyone in the schools. The rate of return for this questionnaire was 84% Cohort 1, 84% Cohort 2, and 75% Cohort 3.

Findings from the School Improvement Project

Findings will be reported for each of the 5 variables studied: Administrative Leadership, Emphasis on Basic Skills, Climate, Ongoing Assessment, and Teacher Expectations. A sixth variable, "Other" will also be described. These findings will be differentiated by Cohorts 1 and 2. Cohort 3 implementation data are not yet available. For each strategy implemented, for example, all of the strategies attempted to improve Administrative Leadership, the findings will be judged Very Successful, Successful, Somewhat Successful, Only Slightly Successful, or Not at all Successful, thereby giving a 1-5 continuum of success. Checkmarks

designate Cohort 1 strategies and their success level. X's designate Cohort 2 strategies and success levels. If Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools used the same variables, checks and X's appear to differentiate the success levels. Where some schools (regardless of cohort) reported one level of success and other schools in the same cohort reported a different level of success, X's or checkmarks appear in more than one level of success column.

Table 1 shows the strategies Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools implemented to improve Administrative Leadership.

Insert Table 1 about here.

These nineteen schools implemented nineteen different strategies to improve Administrative Leadership. Only three strategies are common to Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools. These strategies are: Materials Inventory, Faculty Conferences, and development of a School Handbook. Of the 19 strategies implemented, only Materials Inventory is rated "Very Successful." Sixteen strategies ranging from Grade Conferences to Instructional Coordination are rated "Successful." Eight strategies are rated "Somewhat Successful," and seven of the eight strategies are from Cohort 2 schools. Only the Cohort 2 absentee program and their plan to organize children are rated "slightly successful." Eighty-nine percent of Cohort 1's strategies are viewed as Very Successful or Successful, whereas, only 47% of Cohort 2's strategies are rated successful.

To improve Basic Skills instruction in their schools, Cohort 1 and 2 schools selected 27 strategies. Twenty-six percent of these strategies

are common to Cohorts 1 and 2. Cohort 1 schools judged only Math workshops and their Remedial Reading Programs "Very Successful," whereas Cohort 2 schools found their mandated reading programs, Schoolwide Reading Series, Supplementary Materials and Parent Tutors Very Successful. Cohort 1 schools rated 75 percent of their strategies Very Successful or Successful. Cohort 2 schools rated 16% of their strategies very successful and another 60% successful, thereby judging 76% as either very successful or successful. Additional very successful or successful strategies are: mandated reading periods, schoolwide math series, language arts workshops and programs, reading program schoolwide and supplementary reading, schoolwide spelling, reading parent, and spelling workshops, sustained silent reading, and locked-in instruction-mandated periods and timhs for each area.

Insert Table 2 about here.

There are twenty-six strategies to improve School climate listed in Table 3. Ten of these strategies are part of the Cohort 1 list, forty percent of those ten are common to Cohorts 1 and 2, and sixteen strategies are unique to Cohort 2 schools. The strategies shared by Cohorts 1 and 2 are: Improvements to the physical plant, discipline, parent, and security programs. Only improvements to the physical plants, assemblies, the security program, parent handbook, school store, and a program for school/community relations are rated Very Successful. Sixty-one percent of these strategies were judged very successful or successful with only model classroom management and UPA/Parent Workshops rated slightly successful.

Insert Table 3 about here.

The Cohort 1 and 2 schools developed far fewer strategies for improving ongoing assessment of students. There are only twelve strategies for both cohorts and all but one (80%) of the strategies implemented by the Cohort 1 schools were also attempted by Cohort 2 schools. A reading test sophistication program and basal management program were judged very successful. But, the math sophistication program, publishers' skills tests, basal assessment, pupil placement inventories, using standardized tests, teachers keeping copies of standardized test scores, regular student assessment, and a reading inventory were all viewed as successful. Reviewing the class records and basal assessment in two schools were viewed as either slightly successful or not at all successful.

Insert Table 4 about here.

Table 5 focuses only on Cohort 2 schools because only Cohort 2 schools identified strategies for improving teacher expectations of student performance, therefore the data reported here are from only eight schools instead of from 19 schools as with the other variables. Thus, there can be no comparison of Cohort 1 to Cohort 2 schools on this variable.

Insert Table 5 about here.

Attendance contests and a Commendation System were rated Very Successful. An expectations workshop was rated successful, and student halls of fame, assemblies, reading goals, positive reinforcement, and schoolwide reading and math goals as well as teacher/pupil student assessment conferences are rated somewhat successful. Some Cohort 2 schools also rated

the student halls of fame and assemblies as only slightly successful. The Black Studies Program was rated not at all successful.

The final table, Table 6, shows how Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools rated the success of EPIE discussions, time-on-task, and workshops. All of these activities are rated somewhat successful by Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 teachers.

Insert Table 6 about here.

Summary: School Improvement Project. The findings for each of the variables in the School Improvement Project. When designing strategies for improving Administrative Leadership, Basic Skills, and School Climate, there is so much difference in the strategies selected by Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools that it is difficult to discern real patterns.

Administrative Leadership improvement strategies developed by Cohort 1 schools generally fall into a category that could be labeled procedural, strategies such as inventorying materials, designating a Resource Room, scheduling a variety of conferences, and writing "school" documents--a handbook and job descriptions. Interestingly enough, these organizational and paper and pencil tasks were the strategies viewed as successful. Cohort 2 schools overlapped very little with Cohort 1 schools but added Instructional Supervision and coordination as well as uniform classroom practices. So, the Cohort 2 schools selected more directive, interactive strategies to improve administrative leadership. They ranked their absentee program and plan to organize children as slightly effective.

A similarly complicated pattern emerges with Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools seeking to improve Basic Skills. Generally, Cohort 1 schools

implemented a number of organizational or procedural strategies: workshops in math, language arts, and grouping; programs in remedial reading, math, language arts, and reading. These Cohort 1 schools also selected to work on communication and listening centers. Cohort 2 schools, on the other hand, developed more interactive strategies with parent and peer tutoring programs; reading and spelling workshops, a writing program, and two types of new classroom reading strategies, sustained silent reading and a Great Books program. Here, too, the Cohort 2 schools appear to be moving further into the classroom to more activities directly with students to derive their strategies.

The longest list of strategies is for improving school climate and here again if there is a change from Cohort 1 to Cohort 2 schools, it seems to be toward more specific activities. Beyond working to improve the physical plant, a strategy that both cohorts selected, Cohort 1, focused on assemblies, discipline, parent, security, and parent volunteer programs while Cohort 2 schools became a bit more specific and developed strategies for: parents and the community; in-school programs for student council, school passes, staff breakfasts, the lunchroom, and transitions from one activity to another. Cohort 2 attempts to change very basic problems with a behavior code, classroom management, and reinforcement were among their least successful efforts.

There was a great deal of overlap of Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools on ongoing assessment, and this may well be because ongoing assessment is a much less sensitive issue than administrative leadership or school climate. It is also possible (and highly probable) that because ongoing assessment

was (1) a new area, and (2) an area in which the staff could clearly develop procedural strategies, there was much more de facto agreement between the two cohorts. Both cohorts saw test sophistication, basal management, and basal assessment as important. Again, though, Cohort 2 schools seemed to go further than Cohort 1 schools by also implementing more teacher record keeping (inventories, assessments, test scores, regular assessments) as well as more frequent (and successful) uses of standardized tests.

No comparison is possible for the teacher expectation variable since only Cohort 2 schools addressed this issue, though this in itself is telling. The Cohort 2 group implemented a variety of activities (assemblies, contests, and awards) designed to raise teacher expectations and focus on high performing students.

The "other" strategies all revolved around the EPIE process, and they met with little success. So, generally, Cohort 2 schools "went farther"--more directive, farther away from procedural or paper and pencil changes--more to the heart of the matter--to implement changes that were more individually behavioral and interactive with students or other groups. The success of the ongoing assessment strategies also suggests that to make schools more effective, it is easier to introduce new behaviors than it is to change old behaviors associated with administrative leadership, basic skills, or school climate.

The next report departs in one sense, and yet in another sense picks up where the McCarthy, Canner, Chawla, and Pershing (1982) study leaves off. This study is of interviews with instructional staff implementing Direct

Instruction Follow Through. This study is but one aspect of the implementation studies conducted in this Follow Through site.

Study of Direct Instruction Follow Through Implementation

Background

In 1978, the University of Oregon Direct Instruction Follow Through Model agreed to sponsor a previously self-sponsored Follow Through site. (See Meyer, Gersten, & Gutkin, in press; Meyer, in press; Rhine, 1981; or Becker, 1977 for descriptions of the Federally funded Follow Through Project.) When agreeing to work with this new site, the University of Oregon as sponsor requested and received from the federal government funds targeted to study the implementation of the Direct Instruction Model in the site.

The implementation plan for this site included a Project Manager from the University of Oregon. The Project Manager was responsible for the overall implementation of the Oregon model at this site. She spent about fifty percent of her time at the site, and while she was at the site she most often worked directly with teachers or classroom aides in their classrooms by observing or demonstrating the program. She trained Principals and worked with a consultant from the University of Oregon to train three Resource Teachers.

The Resource Teachers were employees of the School District. They were released from classroom responsibilities to be full-time trainers and monitors of the Follow Through program. Their experience as Resource Teachers varied, but all were new to Direct Instruction Follow Through in the fall of 1978 when they began working with the Project Manager and Oregon consultant to implement the program.

The Resource Teachers had a one week training session with the local Project Director and Oregon consultant in the late summer of 1978. Then the Project Manager, Oregon Consultant, and Resource Teachers worked together to conduct pre-service training for all Follow Through staff before school began in the fall of 1978. The Project Manager, Oregon Consultant and Resource Teachers also worked together on regularly scheduled inservice training programs for Cohort 1 and Limited First Year teachers and classroom aides. A similar pre-service and inservice plan took place in 1979 for the Cohort 2 teachers and aides.

The data that follow were gathered to answer the question, "What are the influences and events on members of the local education agency as reactions does the Local Education Agency (LEA) have to Directed Development?" and the question, "Do the local education agency's views about Directed Development change as the implementation proceeds from the first through the second year?" In this study, teachers, paraprofessional aides, resource teachers and sponsor-consultants answered questions during individual, semi-structured interviews. Participation in the study was voluntary, but 23 of the 35 teachers and 25 of the 60 aides participated. These data were gathered during the second year of the implementation.

It is important to note that this site was directed by the federal government to include in their design for their 1978-1979 school year a plan for implementing a curriculum distinct from the curriculum in their school district. Negotiations between the school district and the University of Oregon spanned the summer of 1978. When the teaching staff returned to school in the fall of 1978, they were told of the changes in the Follow Through Program.

The interviews. The interviewer assured all participants that their responses would be reported anonymously. He also reviewed the goals of the program. Interviews averaged about one hour and fifteen minutes for teachers and between 30 and 45 minutes for classroom aides. The first 15-20 minutes of the interviews involved administration of the Hall, Loucks, Rutherford, and Newlove (1975) Levels of Use questionnaire. The results of the administration of this instrument have been reported elsewhere (Emrick, Peterson, & Cronin, Note 4; Cronin, Note 5). The findings from the interviews with the Levels of Use instrument failed to correlate with observations of specific teaching behaviors and student achievement gains (Zoref, Note 1; Gersten, Carnine, Zoref, & Cronin, Note 6). Therefore, those data are omitted from this report. The focus of this report will instead be the information gathered from the interviews.

The teachers' interviews were structured to determine (1) personal demographic information, (2) the general match between the teacher's educational ideology and the ideology of the Direct Instruction Model, (3) the teacher's perceptions about the specificity of the model, (4) the amount of change the teacher had to accomplish in order to implement the model, (5) if and how teachers felt that their self-concepts changed as they implemented the model, (6) how adequate the teachers felt their initial training had been to implement the model, including the support they received during the implementation, and (7) the teachers' reports of support that they received from their principals.

The interviews with the classroom aides differed slightly from the interviews with the teachers. These interviews focused on (1) personal demographics,[1] (2) perceived clarity and difficulty of the model,[2]

(3) general attitudes toward the model,[3] (4) perceived adequacy of pre-service and inservice training,[4] (5) feelings about the position and responsibilities of classroom aides, (6) changes the aides had made in the program, and (7) the aides' perceptions of the impact of the model.[5]

Cohort 1 teachers and aides were those who began teaching in the Direct Instruction kindergarten or first graders in 1978--the first year of the implementation and continued into the second year of the implementation. Teachers and aides who taught in DI Follow Through second or third grades during the 1978-1979 school year while the program in those grades consisted of less than the total Follow Through curriculum are identified as a "Limited First Year Experience" group. Cohort 2 aides and teachers began in the Direct Instruction model in the second year of the program's implementation, 1979-1980.

The findings for each of the eight major teacher interview questions appear on Table 7. By reading down the table for each group of teachers (Cohort 1, Limited First Year, and Cohort 2), one develops a "profile" of dominant characteristics or sentiments from the teachers in these three groups. Comments or phrases that apply to more than one group are centered below the appropriate groups' headings. Table 8 is set up in a similar fashion to represent information gleaned from interviewing the classroom aides.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here.

Cohort I teachers. Most Cohort I teachers (71%) were generally unclear about implementing the program immediately after preservice training. They developed clear-cut pictures of what they were to do a few months later. Thirty percent found Direct Instruction Follow Through very different from their previous experience because of (a) the emphasis on time on task, and (b) the highly structured lessons that 40% found monotonous, but 20% reported delight because of their reduced preparation time. Virtually all Cohort I teachers found the program easy to master, concise, well-defined, and straight-forward. Half of the teachers also found the program non-threatening.

Cohort I teachers often cited problems in their first year (1978-1979) due to "insensitive monitors," insensitive peers (14%), or inconsistent feedback (29%), although they acknowledged the availability and promptness of materials. The Cohort I teachers felt strongly that the program's ambience improved greatly in their second year (1979-1980), though placing and teaching new students, a feeling of holding back higher-performing students (reported by 50% of the teachers), and the need for a transition room for incoming students were commonly acknowledged problems.

All Cohort I teachers agreed with Direct Instruction Follow Through's emphasis on basic skills, and they acknowledged the need to salvage Follow Through. Half of the teachers emphasized the need for Distar, though some were concerned about the lack of "fun." They also questioned the long-term effects of the program. Half of the teachers were satisfied with their administrative support, and a third felt they had particularly supportive principals, although they felt that their principals had little to do with the program's ongoing implementation.

Cohort 1 teachers generally felt that they functioned autonomously in their roles, without support from their peers. They also felt that their initial holistic-humanistic ideological clashes lessened and that their philosophies evolved to Direct Instruction over their two years of experience. Many Cohort 1 teachers felt that Distar either contributed to their success or increased their effectiveness. The teachers also felt that their students increased in self-reliance, had greater social maturity, and were better behaved.

Cohort 1 teachers viewed their pre-service and inservice training differently, and their views about pre-service changed markedly from their first year (1978-1979) to their second year (1979-1980). During their first pre-service, the teachers felt patronized, rushed, overwhelmed, anxious and pressured. They felt their second pre-service was more sensitive, less rushed, and repetitive. They also described their Project Manager as credible, fair, and willing to serve. These teachers emphasized that their best perspective came from their own classrooms.

Inservice training varied in relevance and utility according to the Cohort 1 teachers, but it addressed practical issues. Some (25%) found inservice training boring but necessary, helpful, but frustrating when the topics covered were different from those they were teaching. All teachers felt they needed inservice training beyond review of teaching techniques that they were already doing.

The pictures painted by all teachers of the Consultants' assistance and support, and the Resource Teachers' support are complicated. The Project Manager's visits were seen as helpful by half the teachers, and

three fourths of the teachers said very positive things about their Project Manager, particularly in terms of the feedback that the Project Manager gave them. A common theme, though was that the teachers wanted more demonstrations and fewer observations. They clearly perceived the Project Manager to be more skilled than the Resource Teachers who were understandably seen as less experienced and skilled in their roles.

Limited first year teachers. There are rather predictable similarities and differences between Cohort 1 and Limited First Year Teachers since these groups experienced the same pre-service training but then clearly had very different implementation experiences. The Limited First Year teachers were not expected to have full-blown Direct Instruction implementations and thereby they received proportionately reduced in-classroom services from the Project Manager, Consultants, and Resource Teachers.

Some (50%) of the Limited First Year teachers had a vague picture of what to do after pre-service training, but a third had a clear picture of what was expected of them. Their comments about the difficulty and magnitude of change expected of them because of structure or other variables matched the comments of the Cohort 1 teachers. Their voluntary participation during 1978-1979 suggested that the Limited First Year teachers may have designed their own discomfort. They volunteered to participate in the program knowing they would not receive much help. Limited First Year teachers agreed with Cohort 1 teachers that "new admits"--incoming students caused placement problems that would have been well-served by a transition room.

The Limited First Year teachers agreed with the Cohort 1 teachers about (1) the Direct Instruction objectives, (2) the perceived administrative

support, (3) the lack of collegial support, and (4) the shift in educational ideology from a holistic philosophy to a Direct Instruction philosophy during their two years of Direct Instruction Follow Through experience. They also agreed with the Cohort 1 teachers that Distar contributed to their success and 50% felt Distar increased their effectiveness. Likewise, the Limited First Year Teachers perceived a variety of positive changes in their students' independence and affect.

Limited First Year teachers emphasized the same differences between pre-service training in 1978 and 1979 that the Cohort 1 teachers felt, painting a much less rushed, sensitive picture of their second pre-service sessions. The Limited First Year Teachers also agreed with the Cohort 1 teachers that inservice training was valuable, but sometimes boring, but that it prevented bad habits. They echoed the praise for the Project Manager voiced by the Cohort 1 teachers. Limited First Year teachers and Cohort 1 teachers addressed the same issues when asked about the consultants' assistance and support, and the Resource teachers' support. They clearly viewed their Project Manager as a valuable source of feedback and support, wanting more demonstrations and fewer observations. They mentioned inconsistent expectations between Oregon consultants and the Resource Teachers and they recognized the difference in experience between the recently trained Resource Teachers and the much more experienced Oregon staff. Both groups of teachers found the Resource Teachers hard-working and usually helpful with only 20% finding them inconsistent and ineffective.

Cohort 2 teachers. The Cohort 2 teachers differ substantially from the Cohort 1 and Limited First Year teachers, and most of these differences

were in a positive direction. A majority of the Cohort 2 teachers were clear about what they were to do immediately after their pre-service training, they remained clear about their responsibilities both a few months later as well as at the time of their interviews. They experienced the same difficulties and magnitude of change required of the Cohort 1 and Limited First Year teachers.

Half of the Cohort 2 teachers felt "checked up on" when they were observed, perceived inconsistent feedback, and experienced classroom management problems, and these percentages are somewhat higher than those expressed by the Cohort 1 and Limited First Year teachers. Cohort 2 teachers agreed with all of the other teachers about the Direct Instruction objectives, the need to salvage the Follow Through program, and the administrative support they received, despite their principals' lack of involvement in the overall implementation. Forty percent of the Cohort 2 teachers felt that they benefitted from peer help and moral support. These teachers failed to experience the holistic-Direct Instruction clash described by the Cohort 1 and Limited First Year teachers. Cohort 2 teachers did feel, however, that Distar was too oriented toward basic skills, and they yearned to "round out" the school day. These same teachers, though, credited Distar with contributing to their success and effectiveness, and with making notable changes in the independence, maturity, and decreased acting out of their students.

Cohort 2 teachers said they made a smoothe transition from pre-service training to their classrooms, and they were generally "satisfied" with inservice training. The Cohort 2 teachers viewed the Project Manager and Resource Teachers favorably, though they too pointed out the differences

in the experience-levels of the Oregon staff and the local Resource Teachers.

Summary: teachers' perspectives. The teachers' responses show a distinct pattern of implementation improvement and satisfaction. Generally, the program's rocky start was accepted and understood by those who experienced it because of the pressure the district was under to salvage Follow Through and the speed with which administrators decided to implement the Oregon model. There were substantially more positive comments about the second year's pre-service training by the Cohort 1 and the Limited First Year Teachers, thus suggesting less confusion and more acceptance after just one year. All teachers described the difficulty and magnitude of changes they experienced because of the Direct Instruction Follow Through implementation as they implemented procedures different from those suggested by their ideologies. All teachers found plentiful materials, and they agreed with the Direct Instruction objectives. These teachers also acknowledged and appreciated administrative support, despite the lack of direct involvement from their principals.

Cohort 2 teachers felt that they benefitted from the support of their peers, and they were the first group to have others around (peers) who had "been through" the same experience and could therefore be supportive. The Cohort 2 teachers did not have the same philosophical clash between their ideologies and the ideologies of the Oregon model. This ready acceptance of the model suggests that generally things were simply easier and smoother for the second group of teachers. The level of support for the Project Manager and Resource Teachers, despite recognized and understandable differences in their level of skills also suggests that the

Cohort 2 teachers appreciated concrete help, particularly the help that they got in their classrooms.

There is much less information from the interviews with the classroom aides. The reduced amount of information may be due in part to the difference in interview time for aides (30 minutes average) as compared to teachers (averaging over an hour and a quarter). Also, the sample of aides was smaller than the sample of teachers interviewed. Another reason for the reduced amount of information gleaned from the aides' interviews could be that the aides' lack of formal training in the field of education afforded less need for them to compare ideological issues or "changes" in their behaviors. There are, however, several themes from the aides that are very similar to comments made by the teachers.

Classroom Aides' Interviews

Cohort 1 classroom aides. The two Cohort 1 Aides who had had experience teaching Distar prior to the implementation of Direct Instruction Follow Through expressed clearly different perspectives about their work, though they agreed that Distar is effective, and that training was repetitious. Other than these two points of agreement, the two experienced aides had very different feelings about their work and the satisfaction that they derived from teaching.

The other Cohort 1 aides, those who were new to Direct Instruction at the beginning of pre-service training in 1978, were pleased with and gratified by their work. These aides were concerned, though, about the responsibilities that they had and the inconsistent feedback they received. Their responses about observations and demonstrations matched the teachers'

responses: they felt they were observed a great deal and they wanted more demonstrations. They praised the excellence of the Language program and found inservice helpful.

Limited first year aides. The Limited First Year Aides split with 50 percent finding inservice training boring and 50 percent finding it helpful, though two-thirds of these aides had only limited supervision. They described the Distar program as "clear" and "straightforward," and described their work as "a challenge." They were impressed with their students' performance, and recognized the importance of strengthening the Follow Through program. It was clear that they knew the district needed a special curriculum for Follow Through. They viewed the Consultants and Resource Teachers as sensitive and helpful. The Limited First Year Classroom Aides echoed the teachers' and Cohort 1 Aides' requests for fewer observations and more demonstrations.

Cohort 2 classroom aides. Cohort 2 Classroom Aides were almost unanimous (90%) in finding Distar easy to learn. They credited their preservice and inservice training with helping them, and they viewed the Resource Teachers as sensitive and supportive. These Cohort 2 Classroom Aides also felt the Resource Teachers' classroom visits were "crucial." This group reported high job satisfaction, though 40% experienced conflict over the amount of responsibility they had and what they were paid. The Cohort 2 aides mentioned behavior management training as something that they needed. Only 10 percent of the Cohort 2 aides mentioned having problems implementing the first year.

Summary: Classroom aides' perspectives. Most of the aides' comments are very similar to comments from the Follow Through teachers. Generally,

the aides viewed the help they received very positively, though as with the teachers, they would have preferred more demonstrations and fewer observations. The aides seemed resigned to inservice training as sometimes boring, but necessary. It is important to note that the aides experienced some conflict over their active teaching role and the responsibilities inherent in that role. It is not surprising that the aides felt an imbalance between their responsibilities and their pay. Consistently, these aides praised the materials that they were working from, and the changes that they saw in their students.

Discussion and Implications

This paper began by tracing the research on program implementation, school change, from the findings of the highly cited Rand Report (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975), to the attempts of the Experienced-Based Career Education (EBCE) program to implement the Rand Report's concept of Mutual Adaptation (Farrar et al. 1980-a, 1980-b), and then to the reanalysis of the Rand Report data (Datta, 1980, 1981) on program implementation. By tracing the Berman and McLaughlin findings to the Farrar, DeSanctis, and Cohen problems, and finally to the Datta (1980, 1981) reanalysis, it is apparent that major studies of school change point to "Directed Development," as the change strategy that gets a new program in place fastest and most effectively. A rather clear profile of "expert" help also emerses from this research. The expert that makes the implementation work is one who works closely with staff in their classrooms to make changes that increase the teacher's effectiveness and the student performance.

The test of the Datta (1980, 1981) findings lies in part in the data cited in great detail in the McCarthy et al. (1982) and Cronin (1980)

studies. For, in analyzing the results of these studies it is possible to see how teachers respond during implementation. The School Improvement Program implementation is apparently moving toward greater direction in their development as the movement progresses from one Cohort of schools to another. The Cohort 2 strategies are much more specific than the Cohort 1 strategies, and one can hope that as the SIP continues to collect implementation and student achievement data a clear set of strategies and procedures for implementing these strategies will emerge.

Recall that the SIP and the Oregon Follow Through Model were at different stages of development when these implementation studies were done. The five Edmonds' variables (administrative leadership, emphasis on basic skills, ongoing assessment, school climate, and teacher expectations) emerged from research on effective schools in 1979. Edmonds' plan then for the New York City SIP involved assigning liaisons between the Central Board of Education and each project school, and then having the liaisons work with his/her school to do Needs Assessments, develop strategies for improvements for each of the five areas that need help, and then implement those strategies. So, with the SIP, while the five variables and the processes were dictated, liaisons and school personnel came up with their own strategies. It is then these strategies that are clearly moving in an increasingly "directed," interactive classroom/personnel-specific way--away from procedural and paper and pencil changes to changes in behavior.

The Oregon Model, by comparison, has been evolving since the mid 1960's. It has become increasingly clearly articulated since 1968 when the first Follow Through sites began. There have been some changes in

curriculum and procedures over the years. The changes evolved through the research and development years while many Oregon staff spent countless hours working with teachers in classrooms. These changes have always been implemented using Directed Development.

In fact, the implementation model is parallel to the teaching model. It has also always been a model that has required Project Managers and Consultants to spend an average of 25% - 50% time at their sites. It has also been dictated that Oregon staff then spend about 85% of their on site time in classrooms. Thus there is a great deal of time allocated to working with teachers in classrooms in very interactual ways. Many of the Oregon staff have worked with a number of school districts for over a decade and they are very experienced in classrooms. It is also important to note that although one could, with just cause be somewhat skeptical of self-report data about behavior, these interviews dealt with perceptions and feelings and therefore may be more reliable.

Joyce (1980) found that when teachers only attended workshops on new techniques, they achieved an implementation level of about 15%--they incorporated little information from the workshop into their classroom practices. Joyce reported increasing levels of implementation as the specificity of help moved into their classrooms so that teachers receiving practical "expert" help in their classrooms had implemented about 85% of the new practices. Such different results from these treatments is not at all surprising if we consider what we expect teachers to do when implementing new strategies. First, we are expecting teachers to change behaviors--behaviors that they have often been practicing several hours per day for anywhere from a few months to years. Even simple behavioral

changes are difficult to achieve, and when asking, or demanding that teachers change how they teach, particularly when there is reason to suggest that the new techniques are different ideologically and behaviorally from those that they learned and accepted in college, we are asking for a paradigm shift in Kuhn's (1970) terms. Changes of this magnitude are difficult to accomplish and can reasonably be expected if the teachers have adequate feedback and support while they are learning and implementing their changes.

In conclusion, then, these studies suggest that while a program is in its research and development phase, the developers can learn a great deal from working with schools and teachers in their classrooms. Once the program is developed and therefore clearly articulated, the Directed Development strategies will be most effective to implement the program. These studies also demonstrate that teachers are very willing to accept direction when they get practical, "expert" help in their classrooms that pays off in changes in their effectiveness and in the performance of their students. Teachers seldom receive college training that teaches them how to monitor their own behavior or the behavior of their students. So, an effective implementation strategy will provide this kind of monitoring and feedback. Berry (1979) put these issues into perspective when she stated, "administrators may choose the programs, but it is teachers who implement them" (p.).

Reference Notes

1. Zoref, L. S. A prototype for how to evaluate implementation of a structured educational program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.

2. Zimiles, H., Mayer, R., & Wickens, E. Bringing child-centered education to the public schools: A study of school intervention. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1980.

3. McCarthy, D. P., Canner, J., Chawla, L., & Pershing, A. School improvement project: Third annual process evaluation, 1981-1982. New York: New York Public Schools, 1982.

4. Emrick, J. A., Peterson, S. M., & Cronin, D. P. San Diego implementation study: Case study report and first-year measurement development. Part two: Development of general measures of implementation. Los Altos, Calif.: John A. Emrick & Associates, 1979.

5. Cronin, D. P. Implementation study, year 2: Instructional staff interviews. Los Altos, Calif.: John A. Emrick & Associates, 1980.

6. Gersten, R., Carnine, D., Zoref, L., & Cronin, D. Measuring implementation of educational innovations in a broad context: Reflections on the evolution of model-specific observational code. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

References

Anderson, L. M., Evertson, C. M., & Brophy, J. E. An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. Elementary School Journal, 1979, 79, 193-322.

Becker, W. C. Teaching reading and language to the disadvantaged--What we have learned from field research. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47, 518-543.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. Federal programs supporting educational change (Vol. IV): The findings in review. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corp., 1975.

Berry, M. The teacher and the Rand study. Today's Education, 1979.

Datta, L. E. Changing times: The study of federal programs supporting educational change and the case for local problem solving. Teachers College Record, 1980, 82, 101-115.

Datta, L. E. Damn the experts and full steam ahead. Evaluation Review, 1981, 5, 5-31.

Edmonds, R. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 1979, 16, 1-16.

Farrar, E., DeSanctis, J. E., & Cohen, D. K. Views from below: Implementation research in education. Teachers College Record, 1980, 82, 77-100. (a)

Farrar, E., DeSanctis, J. E., & Cohen, D. K. The lawn party: The evolution of federal programs in local settings. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 167-171. (b)

Good, T., & Grouws, D. The Missouri mathematics effectiveness project. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 355-362.

Goodlad, J. I. The dynamics of educational change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L., & Newlove, B. W. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 26(1), 5-9.

Havelock, R. G. The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Joyce, B. Guaranteeing carryover from workshops to classrooms. Paper presented, invited address, University of Oregon, 1981.

Kennedy, M. Findings from the follow through planned variation study. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7, 3-11.

Kuhn, T. S. The structure of scientific revolutions. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1970.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 1978, 80(1), 69-94.

Meyer, L. A. Teaching basic skills to low income children: One community's approach. Journal of Rural Education, Spring 1983.

Meyer, L. A., Gersten, R. M., & Gutkin, J. Direct instruction: A project follow through success story. Elementary School Journal, forthcoming, 1983.

Rhine, W. R. (Ed.), Making schools more effective. New York: Academic Press, 1981.

Rivlin, A. M., & Timpane, P. M. (Eds.), Planned variations in education. Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1975.

Schmuck, R. A., Runkel, P. J., Arends, J. H., & Arends, R. I. The second handbook of organization development in schools. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1977.

Stallings, J. Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher, 1980, 9, 11-16.

Weick, K. E. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, 1-19.

Weikart, D. P., & Banet, B. A. Model design problems in follow through In A. M. Rivlin & P. M. Timpane (Eds.), Planned variation in education. Washington, D.C.: 1975.

Footnotes

1, 2, 3, 4, 5. These aspects of the interviews with the classroom aides are stated in the final report of the Interview Study reported by Cronin, 1980.

Table 1

(N = 19 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 1 & 2
Schools on Strategies
to Improve Administrative Leadership

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful		Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Grade Conferen	✓			✓				
Materials Inven	✓	X	X	✓				
Resource Room	✓			✓				
Faculty Conferen	✓	X		✓	X			
School Handbook	✓	X		✓	X	✓		
School Procedures	✓			✓				
Job Descriptions	✓			✓				
School Communica	✓	X		✓		X		
Admin Ass't Prog		X			X			
Instruc Supervision		X			X	X		
Equipment Purchase Organ Play Prog		X			X			
Reorgan Clusters		X			X			
Instruc Coordin		X			X	X		
Uniform Classwork/Homework		X			X	X		
Behavior Code		X				X		
Guided Pupil Prep		X				X		

Table 1 (Cont.)

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Inventory Management		X			X		
Absentee Program		X				X	
Plan to Organize Children		X				X	

Table 2

(N = 19 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 1 & 2
Schools on Strategies
to Improve Basic Skills

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful		Somewhat Successful		Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Math Workshop	✓	X	✓					X	
Remedial Rdg Prog	✓	X	✓				X		
Mandated Rdg Period	✓	X		X	✓				
Schoolwide Math Ser	✓	X			✓	✓	X		
Lang Arts Wkshp	✓				✓	✓			
Lang Arts Prog	✓	X			✓	X		X	
Rdg Prog	✓	X			✓	✓	X		
Schoolwide Rdg Series	✓	X		X	✓	X			
Schoolwide Spelling	✓				✓				
Supplemen Rdg	✓				✓				
Grouping Worksh	✓				✓				
Commun Arts	✓				✓				
Listening Centers	✓					✓			
Rdg Consultants	✓					✓			
T's Resource Room	✓					✓			
Individ Math	✓					✓			
Supplem Materials		X		X		X	X		
Parent Tutors		X		X					
Peer/Parent Tutors		X			X				

Table 2 (cont.)

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Rdg Workshops		X		X	X		
Spelling Workshops		X		X			
USSR		X		X	X		
Great Books		X		X			
Parent Workshps-R		X		X			
Math Prog		X		X	X		
Locked-in Instruc		X		X			
Schoolwide Writing		X			X		

Table 3

(N = 19 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 1 & 2

Schools on Strategies

to Improve School Climate

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Physical Plant Improved	✓	X	✓	✓	X		
Assemblies	✓		✓	✓			
Movement Ed	✓			✓			
Discipline Prog	✓	X		✓	X		
Welcome Desk	✓			✓			
Morale Activities	✓				✓		
Lunch Recess	✓				✓		
Parent Program	✓	X		X	✓		
Security Program	✓	X	X		✓		
Parent Volunteer Prog	✓					✓	
Parent Handbook		X	X				
School Store		X	X				
Sch/Comm Relations		X	X				
Stud. Council		X		X			
Pass SYS		X		X			
Biwkly Staff B'fast		X		X			

Table 3 (cont.)

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Lunch Rm Pro		X		X			
Sch Safety		X		X			
Transition Pro		X		X			
Communica		X		X			
Sch Cleanliness		X		X	X		
Home/Sch Coop		X			X		
Posi Reinfor		X			X		
School Beh Code		X			X		
Model Class Manage		X				X	
UPA/Parent Wksp		X				X	

Table 4

(N = 19 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 1 & 2

Schools on Strategies

to Improve Ongoing Assessment

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful		Somewhat Successful		Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Test Sophis Prog-R	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X		
Test Soph Prog-M	✓	X		✓		✓	X		
Pub's Skills Test	✓			✓					
Basal Management	✓	X	X	✓					
Basal Assessment	✓	X			X	✓		X	✓
Pupil Place Inven		X			X				
Assess/Record Keep		X			X				
Use Stand. Tests		X			X				
T's Keep Test Scor		X			X				
Reg. Assess S's		X			X				
Rdg Inven		X			X				
Review Class Rec		X						X	

Table 5

(N = 8 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 2 Schools

on Teacher Expectations

Strategy	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Only Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
Attendance Contests	X	X				
Commendation System	X	X				
Expectations Wkshp	X		X			
Stud Hall of Fame	X			X	X	
Stud Recog Assem	X			X	X	
Pupil Rdg Goals	X			X		
Positive Reinf	X			X		
Sch Wide R & M Goals	X			X		
T/P Stud Asses Conf	X			X		
Black Studies Prog						X

Table 6

(N = 19 Schools)

Composite Ratings from Cohort 1 & 2

Schools on "Other" Strategies

Strategy	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Very Successful	Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at all Successful
EPIE - Disc	✓	X			X		
EPIE - Time on Task	✓				✓		
EPIE - Workshops	✓	X			✓ X		

Table 7

Direct Instruction Teacher Interviews

Questions/Issues	Cohort 1 N = 7	Teachers' Responses Limited First Year N = 6	Cohort 2 N = 10
1. Clarity			
a. After preservice	71% unclear	50% vague, 33% very clear	majority, "reasonably clear," 10% "too clear"
b. 3-4 months later	clear-cut picture		clear
c. at the present time			clear
2. Difficulty/Magnitude of change	←	30% very different because of a. Time on task b. Highly structured 40% effective but monotonous 20% delighted at reduced prep time Program easy to master, 10% "child's play" Concise, well defined, and straightforward 50% Non-threatening	→

Table 7 (cont.)

3. Capability (materials & advice)	Problematic, 78-79 Insensitive monitors 29% inconsistent feedback 14% insensitive peers Available & prompt materials Ambience improved 79-80	Self-imposed discomfort Voluntary implementation	50% felt "checked up" on 50% perceived inconsistent feedback 50% classroom management problems Advice forthcoming Plentiful materials
	←	New student arrivals 50% felt held back s's needed transition room	→
4. Motivation a. Agreement with DI objectives	←	All agreed with basic skills emphasis All recognized need to salvage FT 50% underlined FT's need for Distar Concern about exclusion of "fun" Concern about long-range effects	→
b. Perceived Administrative Support	←	50% satisfied with administrative support 33 1/3% particularly supportive principals Principals had little to do with ongoing implementation	→
c. Perceived collegial support	←	Little role Inability to prevail upon Functioned autonomously Some advice & support in second year	→ 40% benefitted from peer help Moral support

Table 7 (cont.)

d. Compatibility with Educational Philosophy	<———	Initial holistic-humanistic clash ———>	No philosophical clash Distar too oriented to basic skills "Rounded out" school day
	<———	Philosophy evolved to DI over two years ———>	
	<———	Distar contributed to teachers' success 50% felt Distar increased their effectiveness Increased self reliance, greater social maturity, decreased "acting out" ———>	
5. Preservice Training 1978:	<———	Training rushed and overwhelming Patronizing manner Insensitivity to teachers' anxiety ———> Pressure on consultants	
1979:	<———	More sensitive, less rushed Project manager credible, fair, willing to serve ———> Repetitive training "Best" perspective from their classroom	
			Smooth transition to classroom; 40% wanted discussion, supple mats, & observation

Table 7 (cont.)

6. Inservice Training		Addressed "practical" issues Training varied in relevance and utility 25% Boring, but necessary Prevented bad habits sessions should deal with teachers' concerns 30% frustrating to listen to program they were not teaching Enthusiastic project manager willing to be at teachers' disposal Need for inservice beyond review	More satisfied with inservice
7. Consultants' Assistance and Support		50% derived benefits from Project Manager's classroom visits 75% said nice things about the Project Manager Clear and relevant feedback 40% wanted more demonstrations and fewer observations Inconsistent expectations between Oregon & local supervisors	
8. Resource Teachers' Support		Perceptive, & most effective when demonstrating 40% felt Resource Teachers were inexperienced Seen as "checking up" on teachers Tried hard and usually succeeded to be helpful 50% viewed them as exemplary Hard working, but still learning role 20% inconsistent and ineffective	

Table 8

Direct Instruction Classroom Aide Interviews

	Classroom Aides' Responses		
	Cohort 1 N = 6	Limited First Year N = 9	Cohort 2 N = 10
One experienced aide:	One experienced found it tiring, but effective Felt aides should be paid more Resented clerical tasks Found Distar boring and unpleasant Training repetitious, but somewhat necessary Concern about observations & infrequent demonstrations	66% had limited supervision Found Distar a challenge Clear, straightforward program Impressed with student performance Program demanding Concern over money Work satisfaction Recognized importance of strengthening the program 50% inservice boring 50% inservice helpful	90% Distar easy to learn Credited preservice & inservice sessions Classroom visits crucial Sensitive & supportive resource teachers 40% conflict over responsibility and salaries Job satisfaction Sought behavior management 10% problems implementing first year
Another experienced aide:	"Spices up" her teaching Enjoyed teaching children and other aides Satisfaction compensated for marginal salary Found consultant visits helpful Found inservice repetitive	Pleased with sensitivity of consultants & resource teachers Viewed consultants as helpful Demonstrations more valuable than monitoring	
	Pleased with their success, gratified Responsibility for teaching unsettling Inconsistent feedback Too many observations, too few demonstrations Inservice helpful Superior language program (Distar)		